UNITED
NATIONS

ST

Secretariat

Distr.
GENERAL

ST/SG/AC.10/C.2/25
26 August 1986

Original: ENGLISH

COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON THE
TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS GOODS

GROUP OF RAPPORTEURS

REPORT OF THE GROUP OF RAPPORTEURS ON ITS THIRTY-FIFTH SESSION

(5-8 August 1986)

CONTENTS

	Paragraphs
ATTENDANCE	1
ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	2
ELECTION OF OFFICERS	5
TESTS AND CRITERIA FOR DIVISIONS 4.1, 4.2 AND 5.1	6 - 19
CHAPTER 9	20 - 23
INTERMEDIATE BULK CONTAINERS (IBCs)	24 - 32
PROVISIONS FOR REFILLABLE GAS CYLINDERS	33 and 34
ENVIRONMENTALLY HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES	35 and 36
CHAPTER 6	37 - 40
LISTING AND CLASSIFICATION	41 - 43

GE.86-23069/4266E

CONTENTS (continued)

	Paragraphs
REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON TEST METHODS FOR ORGANIC PEROXIDES	44 - 47
FUTURE PROGRAMME OF WORK	48 - 50
ADOPTION OF THE REPORT	51

* * *

ANNEXES TO THE REPORT
(see ST/SG/AC.10/C.2/25/Add.1)

Annex 1 - CLASSES 4.2 AND 5.1

Annex 2 - INTERMEDIATE BULK CONTAINERS (IBCs)

Annex 3 - MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS

Annex 4 - REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON LISTING AND CLASSIFICATION

Annex 5 - REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON ORGANIC PEROXIDE TEST METHOD

REPORT

ATTENDANCE

1. Rapporteurs from the following countries: Canada; France; Germany, Federal Republic of; Italy; Japan; Norway; Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; United Kingdom; United States of America. Observers from: the Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland. Representatives of the following specialized agencies and intergovernmental organizations: International Maritime Organization (IMO); International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO); Central Office for International Rail'way Transport (OCTI). Representatives of the following non-governmental organizations: International Air Transport Association (IATA); International Organization for Standardization (ISO); the European Syndicate on Steel Drums (SEFA); the Hazardous Materials Advisory Council (HMAC); the European Council of Chemical Manufacturers' Federations (CEFIC); the European Association of Reconditioners and Dealers in Drums (SERRED) and the European Nitrogen Producers' Association (APEA).

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

2. The provisional agenda (ST/SG/AC.10/C.2/24) was adopted without change.

3. The French delegation expressed surprise that the official calendar of meetings, as recently established by the Executive Secretary, had not been respected. Savings had meant cutting down on some meetings and in particular the elimination of two days - 4 and 15 August - for Groups concerned with dangerous goods. The reinstatement of 4 August 1986 for a meeting whi was informal, although it had been held on United Nations premises, was unusual in the extreme and should not create a precedent. Furthermore, that meeting, for which no interpretation had been provided, had been held under conditions contrary to the rules of procedure of that international organization. In the circumstances, the French delegation was forced to regard such work as had been done the previous day as having no legal value and therefore requested that the entire discussion of the agenda should be resumed immediately.

4. A member of the secretariat noted that the official calendar of meetings, as recently amended, had been strictly adhered to; that informal working groups were a traditional and long established procedure of the Committee and of its subsidiary bodies; and all such groups presented their suggestions to their immediate parent body for approval.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

5. Mr. J. Engeland (Federal Republic of Germany) was unanimously elected Chairman.

TESTS AND CRITERIA FOR DIVISIONS 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 AND 5.1 (see annex 1)

6. For Division 4.1 document ST/SG/AC.10/C.2/R.549 (USSR) contained proposals for amendments to the original text, since that had already been modified by the thirty-fourth session these further amendments were not adopted.

7. For Division 4.2, the rapporteur from Japan announced that his late paper incorporated both previous documents -/R.462 and -/R.519. The rapporteur from the Federal Republic of Germany announced that his late papers superseded -/R.518. Document -/R.509 (United States) was withdrawn.

8. Discussion was based on the most recent Japanese paper. The approach was fully supported by the rapporteur from the Federal Republic of Germany but with the addition of a third sample (5 cm cube) for which he gave a full explanation of why it was desirable. It was then so decided.

9. When discussing the duration of the test and temperature rise the rapporteur from the United States introduced -/R.541 but there was no support for what was felt to be essentially a different type of test.

10. A small working group failed to reach agreement on the actual conditions of temperature and time for the test and some doubts were expressed on the additional 5 cm cube test. It was finally decided that further consultations with national experts were necessary and the alternative figures suggested should appear in square brackets and rapporteurs were requested to verify the conditions in order to be in a position to take final decisions at the Committee session. It was noted that if this 5 cm cube test should be accepted then development and changes, particularly of paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6, would be necessary. The rapporteur from the Federal Republic of Germany offered to prepare and present a flow chart related to this subject.

11. It was agreed that the test discussed above was for self-heating substances of Division 4.2 and a different test was required for pyrophoric substances. In a late paper the Federal Republic of Germany had given some test results related to their porcelain cup test in -/R.518 and the Whatman filter char test. A proposal for a paper char test in -/R.540 (United States) was not adopted. The Group of Rapporteurs adopted the test from -/R.518 providing it was rearranged and edited to conform with the presentation already adopted for these test methods. The rapporteur from the United States expressed serious reservations regarding the appropriateness of the porcelain cup test method for the classification of pyrophoric liquids.

12. For Division 4.3, note was taken of data in a late paper from Japan but no change was made to the text adopted at the previous session.

13. For Division 5.1 the Group had adopted at its thirty-fourth session a text but had left the standard substance to be determined on the basis of tests to be run by various countries using the agreed test method. There were some results in -/R.542 and -/R.543 (United States), -/R.548 (USSR), and late papers from Norway and Japan. The last mentioned had not used the agreed test method. The rapporteur from Norway believed his paper was the only one presenting results of tests done strictly in accordance with the proposed text from the thirty-fourth session, and, because of this, direct comparison with other results could not be made. The Federal Republic of Germany also had some test results and commented on the wide variations that appeared in the different lists. It was agreed, however, that it was extremely difficult to ensure that everyone judged the moment that "all flame has disappeared" in the same manner.

14. The observer from the Netherlands presented a video of tests performed with a number of oxidizing substances. He distributed a paper that compared these results with those from some other countries.

15. Some rapporteurs felt too much emphasis was being placed on the actual time of burning since it was a comparative test between a reference substance and the substances to be classified. Other rapporteurs, while agreeing with the comparative nature of the test, felt that the very large variations between results of different countries put in doubt the basic soundness of the test.

16. However, in order to make progress and under the condition that, at the moment, it should be considered as a guideline test it was agreed to remove the square brackets from the text in ST/SG/AC.10/C.2/23, annex 1 for Division 5.1 including from paragraphs 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 and that in 1.4 two sets of alternative reference substances should be inserted.

17. The rapporteur from Japan, drawing attention to his late paper said he had reservations concerning: (i) the definition of burning time; (ii) the humidity conditions; and (iii) the means of ignition and he would develop these aspects from his paper and relate them to the adopted text for the test in a formal paper for the Committee. The rapporteur from the Federal Republic of Germany wished to be associated with these reservations. The observer from the Netherlands also felt more consideration should be given to particle size of the sawdust, mixing of the sample and the airflow during the test. The rapporteur from the Federal Republic of Germany supported this opinion.

18. The rapporteur from Norway, recalling his document -/R.510, said he was now ready to revise this proposal as a formal document for the Committee, as had been suggested at the previous session (-/23, paragraph 44).

19. A new test method for liquid oxidizers had been proposed in -/R.542 (United States) as an addition to the existing, incomplete test adopted in -/21/Add.1, annex 2 and modified in -/23, annex 1. A small majority felt that a second test of this nature (i.e. related to spontaneous ignition rather than enhanced burning) was desirable. However, there was a general feeling that neither test was entirely satisfactory and that since the priority for a test (or tests) for Division 5.1 liquids was less pressing than for the others then delegates were asked to study the whole question attentively on the basis of the test already adopted (-/21/Add.1, annex 2 modified by -/23, annex 1) and that proposed by the United States in -/R.542.

CHAPTER 9 (see annex 3)

20. The document -/R.471 (SERRED) supported by Japan proposing leakproofness testing for all reused packaging for liquids was modified by the United States by making reference to competent authority discretion. Nevertheless, it was not adopted.

21. The rapporteur from the United States expressed the view that the term "reconditioning" as it appears in 9.3.12 (b) of the Recommendations includes: de-denting; chemical and abrasive cleaning; burning; chaining; caulking; rechiming; painting; and any other physical action that could affect the integrity of a drum.

22. Three separate proposals for this chapter figured in -/R.478 (ICAO); that for 9.5.1 was adopted; that for 9.5.8 was not adopted; the Note to follow 9.5.7 was modified then adopted.

23. The proposal in -/R.526 (Federal Republic of Germany) was received sympathetically but there was some criticism of the wording. In particular, the rapporteur from Japan wished it to be quite clear that it applied only to composite packagings. The rapporteur from the Federal Republic of Germany said he would revise and resubmit his text.

INTERMEDIATE BULK CONTAINERS (IBCs) (see annex 2)

24. The following proposals relate to the text of chapter 16 whether already in the Recommendations or in the reports -/21 and -/23.

25. The views expressed in -/R.532 (CEFIC) were noted. The text in -/R.533 (CEFIC) was accepted as being clearer though not introducing any substantive changes and was adopted.

26. The proposal in -/R.539 (Federal Republic of Germany) for 16.7.3.2.2 concerning the construction of wooden IBCs was adopted.

27. The proposal in -/R.544 (France) was considered to make it possible to avoid the IBC falling on its most vulnerable part and was not adopted.

28. The rapporteur from France explained that paragraph 49 of the report of the last session did not reflect accurately his concern with testing the attachment of an IBC to a pallet and in -/R.555, he proposed a lateral shock test for exactly that purpose. The proposal was not adopted.

29. In a late paper from CEFIC, it was proposed to add a new text to 16.4 and 16.5 under "Operation", concerning the permissible total gauge pressure in a liquid-filled IBC, comparable to that in chapter 9 (9.3.10). This was adopted.

30. There were several proposals in -/R.529 (France) and these were taken separately. The proposal for an alternative top lift test was not adopted. The addition to the drop test was adopted. The proposal concerning the topple test in 16.3.6.5 and whether the exact way in which the IBC was caused to topple should be defined was discussed at length. Eventually with the aid of diagrams, it was decided that it should not be tipped but rather pushed, thus rejecting the French proposal. However, it was felt desirable to define that it should land on its top and a phrase to that effect was adopted. The proposal concerning the righting test was not adopted.

31. The rapporteur from the United Kingdom drew attention to what he believed to be an error in 16.5.9.5.5, namely reference to the inclusion of the base pallet. It was agreed to delete that phrase.

32. The Group of Rapporteurs accepted that no further types of IBCs would be proposed in the immediate future but CEFIC was asked if they would consider developing the text of section 16.2 - Metallic prismatic IBCs, to other metallic IBCs that were not (or only partially) prismatic. This, they agreed to do.

PROVISIONS FOR REFILLABLE GAS CYLINDERS

33. In document -/R.531, ISO had presented recommendations concerning gas cylinders based on ISO 4705-1983, integrating into the text the additional requirements of their annex D. A fruitful discussion revealed much appreciation for the work of ISO but also some remaining problem areas in particular for Japan, the United States and Canada, such as; the definition of the material, filling pressure, design theory, complexity of the marking, tensile testing. The rapporteur from the Federal Republic of Germany felt that there was an urgent need to establish a new chapter in the Recommendations to cover all kinds of pressure vessels, which up to now have no provisions, either in chapter 9 or any other chapter.

34. ISO announced the next meeting of TC 58 scheduled for April 1987 in Washington and a subcommittee to meet in Vienna in November 1986. The opinion was expressed that in ISO, an effective forum for the work already existed and it was better it should continue until completion. Duplication in the Committee's work should be avoided. Every effort should be made for close co-operation with ISO and those national authorities that had most difficulties with the proposed standard should intensify their efforts to reach a consensus as quickly as possible. With the appearance of a generally acceptable standard the Committee could then consider whether simply to make reference to that standard or adopt as much of it as would be desirable.

ENVIRONMENTALLY HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES (see annex 3)

35. Note was taken of -/R.513 (IMO) and the fact that further progress had been made with marine pollutants and a working group would take place in October 1986.

36. The rapporteur from the United Kingdom referred to the text adopted at the Group of Rapporteurs' last session for a new Special Provision (-/23, annex 3) and said it was likely to lead to chaos and proposed that individual modes should be referred to instead of the competent authorities. This was strongly contested by the rapporteur from the United States supported by the rapporteur from Canada. However, the proposal of the United Kingdom was adopted.

CHAPTER 6 (see annex 3)

37. There were a variety of corrections, amendments and suggestions for improvements in -/R.530 (Switzerland). Under "A", point 3 was not adopted as it was a halide but not chlorine; point 6 Formetanate does appear under the UN Nos. listed and therefore no change was necessary (this dealt with -/R.524 (Federal Republic of Germany) on the same subject); points 7, 8, 9 and 10 were not accepted while 11-14 were, with some minor changes to 14. All of "B" and "C" were accepted, a change was made to Special Provision 43 but different to that proposed under "D".

38. Document -/R.554 (United Kingdom) also concerned Special Provision 43. The first proposal had already been decided; the second, for UN No. 1704, was not accepted; and for the third, UN No. 1611, the entry was retained but Special Provision 43 was deleted.

39. The comments in -/R.537 (Federal Republic of Germany) were elaborated on by the rapporteur from the Federal Republic of Germany and it was agreed that this was an important subject but that the Committee should consider the matter on the basis of a document from the Federal Republic of Germany that would give more details on the new conception he had in mind for this division.

40. The rapporteur from the United Kingdom said that the proposals in -/R.545 were intended to make more realistic the packaging requirements for Division 6.2. There was some support for addressing this problem but the document was carried over to the Committee because of lack of time.

LISTING AND CLASSIFICATION (see annex 4)

41. The Group of Rapporteurs approved the report of the working group on listing and classification and adopted the amendments they had suggested.

42. The Group also noted that the report and amendments suggested by the informal group at the thirty-fourth session and reproduced in annex 4 to -/C.2/23 were also approved and ready to submit to the Committee.

43. The rapporteur from the United States drew attention to his paper -/R.464 concerning aircraft thrust devices and igniters. In -/C.2/21, paragraph 69, it had been decided to await evidence as to the continued use of these devices; no evidence had been produced that they were still in use so he proposed that the two entries should be deleted. It was so decided.

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON TEST METHODS FOR ORGANIC PEROXIDES (see annex 5)

44. The Chairman, Mr. Th. Groothuizen (Netherlands), of the organic peroxides working group presented its report to the Group of Rapporteurs and gave a brief resumé of the results achieved. All the test methods and criteria proposed had been examined and test results compared and adjustments, of criteria in particular, proposed where they were considered desirable. Mutual acceptance and harmonization of North American and European test methods was largely achieved which should facilitate the future possible use of this manual by RID/ADR.

45. A consequence of the discussion was the emergence of a problem with differences between the E-mark and the E-label and the working group proposed to introduce two categories of organic peroxides: one not showing explosive properties when packaged - these would not carry an E-mark but a new special provision; the second would carry an E-mark, indicating an E-label. The rapporteur from the United States had offered to develop the changes involved. The rapporteur from the Federal Republic of Germany said that any such changes in the system should be thoroughly examined for consequences.

46. In order to have a completed manual with consequential changes, i.e. to chapter 11, ready for the Committee in December, it was felt that another working group was essential. The rapporteur from the Federal Republic of Germany had extended an invitation to the group to meet in Munich from 20 October; this offer was gratefully accepted.

47. The report of the working group was adopted globally and the delegation of the Netherlands was thanked for the huge amount of work that they had contributed to this project. The production of a French version of the manual in time for the Committee was discussed, the expected date of its completion being too late to meet the 10 weeks rule. The rapporteur from France said, at this stage, he was unable to commit himself to such a task. The rapporteurs from Canada and the United Kingdom said they would help with the French translation as far as possible.

FUTURE PROGRAMME OF WORK

48. Considerable disquiet was expressed by the various rapporteurs over the future of the Committee and its subsidiary bodies. It was noted that the most recent resolution of the Economic and Social Council, E/1986/138, called once again on the Secretary-General to implement the request, already repeated twice, to maintain the staffing of the transport of dangerous goods unit at an adequate level to cope with all the various aspects of the work, both for the Economic and Social Council and the ECE.

49. The Group of Rapporteurs requested that a breakdown of the financial implications of the Committee and its work should be made available to the fourteenth session, both what is currently the allocation and what would be necessary to maintain the work at an efficient level, including secretariat services, publications, travel, etc. It was suggested that each expert should motivate his Government at the highest level to make known their priorities in this field.

50. As for the actual programme of work, this was left for the Committee to decide. In the meantime, it was agreed that all the outstanding documents should be carried over to the Committee's fourteenth session in December 1986, as well as certain late papers that had been requested as formal documents. The Group of Rapporteurs was reminded that the deadline for the reception of Committee documents was 8 September 1986.

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

51. The Group of Rapporteurs adopted the report on its thirty-fifth session and the annexes thereto.